



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/244,550	02/03/1999	HARRIET E. BRICHTA	64-99-001	3859

7590 11/27/2001

ATTEN: MATTHEW B. TALPIS, ESQ
BAKER BOTTS L.L.P.
2001 ROSS AVENUE
SUITE 600
DALLAS, TX 75201-2980

EXAMINER

TESFAMARIAM, MUSSIE

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2162

DATE MAILED: 11/27/2001

17

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

AG

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/244,550

Applicant(s)

Brichta et al

Examiner

Mussie Tesfamariam

Art Unit

2162

-- Th MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136 (a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on Aug 23, 2001
- 2a) ☒ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 35 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-16 and 18-63 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above, claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-16, 18-33, 35, 38-40, 42-47, 50, and 58-63 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 34, 36, 37, 41, 48, 49, and 51-57 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claims _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirements.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are objected to by the Examiner.
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some* c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- *See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e).

Attachment(s)

- 15) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 16) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 17) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s). _____
- 18) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
- 19) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 20) ☐ Other: _____

Art Unit: 2162

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless --

2. Claim 1, 2, 4-8, 11-12, 16, 18-20, 23, 30-31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being unpatentable over Knudson et al, 5765140.

As per claim 1, Knudson et al disclose in informational data associated with accounts, projects, and programs. See the abstract, fig 1-2, fig 4, col 2, lines 1-4, col 3, lines 28-33. He also discloses in financial data associated with the accounts, projects, and programs. See fig 2, fig 4, col 1, lines 16-20, col 2, lines 42-46, col 4, lines 12-14, col 11, lines 16-20. He also discloses in schedule and progress data associated with the accounts, projects, and programs. See the abstract, fig 1-2, fig 4, col 1, lines 9-15, col 2, lines 2-4, 42-45. He also discloses in data associated with personnel, roles, and security access information. See fig 3, col 6, lines 8-40, col 11, lines 21-24, 32-34. He also discloses in a tactic table operable to store at least one

Art Unit: 2162

predefined tactic supported by the program office database and a tactic type for each tactic; a tactic type to progress milestone category to the at least one tactic type; See col 11, lines 38-40, col 12 and update data associated with the progress, actual expenditures, and labor resources of the projects and programs; at least one user interface operable to display data stored in the program office according to a predetermined security scheme based on the security access information stored in the program office database, and further operable to receive the update data on a periodic basis. See the abstract, col 6, lines 26-29, fig 2, 3, col 5, lines 18-25, col 6, lines 27-30, col 7, lines 40-46, col 10, lines 48-54.

As per claim 2, Knudson et al disclose in relational data structures. See fig 1, fig 2, and fig 4.

As per claim 4, Knudson et al disclose in at least one user interface comprises at least one self-extracting executable user interface. See col 6, lines 15-22.

As per claim 5, Knudson et al disclose in at least one user interface comprises at least one program office interface. See col 1, lines 51-60, col 4, lines 42-50.

Art Unit: 2162

As per claim 6, Knudson et al disclose in the program office database comprises more than one copy of the data residing in more than one distributed databases. See fig 1, fig 2, fig 3, fig 4, col 1, lines 16-19.

As per claim 7, Knudson et al disclose in the user interface comprises more than one copy of the user interface residing in more than one distributed computing system. See the abstract, fig 1, col 6, lines 27-30, col 10, lines 45-48.

As per claim 8, Knudson et al disclose in the data associated with security access information of personnel comprise an assignment table associating a person to at least one role defined within a business unit. See the abstract, col 5, lines 18-25, col 6, lines 27-30, col 7, lines 40-46, col 10, lines 48-54.

As per claim 11, Knudson et al disclose in the data associated with security access information of personnel comprise a role definition of a program manager having authorization to view and change all project and account data associated with at least one business unit, and to view and change all personnel data associated with persons assigned to the at least one business unit. See the abstract, col 5, lines 18-25, col 6, lines 27-30, col 7, lines 40-46, col 10, lines 48-54.

Art Unit: 2162

As per claim 12, Knudson et al disclose in data associated with security access information of personnel comprise a role definition of a coordinator having authorization to assign one or more persons to the at least one business unit, assign at least one role to each person, and add projects and accounts for the at least one business unit. See the abstract, col 5, lines 18-25, col 6, lines 27-30, col 7, lines 40-46, col 10, lines 48-54.

As per claim 16, Knudson et al disclose in the data associated with translating progress milestones comprise a data table operable to map milestones predefined in a project to milestone categories predefined within the program office database. See fig 1, col 11, lines 38-40, col 12, lines.

As per claim 18, Knudson et al disclose in a project forecast table operable to store at least one current budget forecast amount for the project; and a project forecast history table operable to store an original budget forecast amount if it is different than the at least one current budget forecast amount. See fig 2, fig 4, col 1, lines 16-20, col 2, lines 42-46, col 4, lines 12-14, col 11, lines 16-20.

As per claim 19, Knudson et al disclose in an account forecast table operable to store at least one revenue and expense budget amount associated with an account;

Art Unit: 2162

and an account actual table operable to store at least one revenue and expense actual amount associated with the account. See fig 2, fig 4, col 1, lines 16-20, col 2, lines 42-46, col 4, lines 12-14, col 11, lines 16-20.

As per claim 20, Knudson et al disclose in the informational data comprise a project table operable to store informational data associated with at least one project identified by a project identifier. See col 4, lines 51-54, col 5, lines 1-3.

As per claim 23, Knudson et al disclose the schedule and progress data comprise a milestone actual table operable to store an amount of progress into a specific milestone for a given project. See the abstract, fig 1, fig 4.

As per claim 30, Knudson et al disclose in a transaction log table operable to record what changes were made to data stored in the program office database, who made the changes, and when the changes where made. See the abstract, col 2, lines 6-12, col 3, lines 32-35.

As per claim 31, Knudson et al disclose in the program office database comprised required data, audit data, program objective specific data, and optional data. See col 2, lines 7-12.

Art Unit: 2162

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claim 3 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Knudson et al, 5765140 as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Gary Hamel et al.

As per claim 3, Knudson et al disclose in at least one user interface comprises personal computers, servers, server networks. See col 3, lines 1-11. However, he fails specifically to disclose in a web-based user interface. Gary Hamel et al disclose in a web-based user interface. See PP 81-82. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify

Art Unit: 2162

Knudson's system such that it will use web. This is because it would improve Knudson's system to be web integrity.

5. Claims 9, 13 and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Knudson et al, 5765140 as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Bates William.

As per claim 9, Knudson et al disclose in the associated with security access information of personnel comprise an assignment table associating a person to at least one role defined within a business unit. See the abstract, col 5, lines 18-25, col 6, lines 27-30, col 7, lines 40-46, col 10, lines 48-54. However, he fails specifically to disclose in having a senior management role within the business unit. Bates William discloses in having a senior management role within the business unit. See PP 2. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Knudson's system such that it have a senior management role within the business unit. This is because it would improve Knudson's system to have an organized business method.

Art Unit: 2162

As per claim 13, Knudson et al disclose in the associated with security access information of personnel comprise an assignment table associating a person to at least one role defined within a business unit. See the abstract, col 5, lines 18-25, col 6, lines 27-30, col 7, lines 40-46, col 10, lines 48-54. However, he fails specifically to disclose in having manager capable of having authorization to update account data and project data. Bates William discloses in having manager capable of having authorization to update account data and project data. See PP 1-3. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Knudson's system such that it have a manager capable of having authorization to update account data and project data. This is because it would improve Knudson's system to have an accurate data.

As per claim 14, Knudson et al disclose in the associated with security access information of personnel comprise an assignment table associating a person to at least one role defined within a business unit. See the abstract, col 5, lines 18-25, col 6, lines 27-30, col 7, lines 40-46, col 10, lines 48-54. However, he fails specifically to disclose in a role definition of a project manager capable of having authorization to update project data. Bates William discloses in a role definition of a project

Art Unit: 2162

manager capable of having authorization to update project data. See PP 1-3.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Knudson's system such that it have a role definition of a project manager capable of having authorization to update project data. This is because it would improve Knudson's system to have an accurate data.

6. Claim 10 and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Knudson et al, 5765140 as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of PMBK.

As per claim 10, Knudson et al disclose in the data associated with security access information of personnel. See col 5, lines 18-25, col 6, lines 27-30, col 7, lines 40-46, col 10, lines 48-54. However, he fails specifically to disclose in definitions of an hierarchy of roles. PMBK discloses in definitions of an hierarchy of roles. See fig 1-1, fig 4-1, fig 5-1, fig 6-1, fig 7-1. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Knudson's system such that it have an hierarchy of roles. This is because it would improve Knudson's system to have an organized roles of data in the program office database.

Art Unit: 2162

As per claim 15, Knudson et al disclose in the data associated with security access information of personnel. See col 5, lines 18-25, col 6, lines 27-30, col 7, lines 40-46, col 10, lines 48-54. However, he fails specifically to disclose in definitions of an hierarchy of roles. PMBK discloses in definitions of an authorization hierarchy of roles. See fig 1-1, fig 4-1, fig 5-1, fig 6-1, fig 7-1. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Knudson's system such that it have an hierarchy of roles. This is because it would improve Knudson's system to have an authorized data.

7. Claims 24-26, 28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Knudson et al, 5765140 in view of Bates William S

As per claim 24, Knudson et al disclose in storing and accessing data associated with at least one project in a program office database, including informational data, financial data, schedule. See the abstract, fig 1-2, fig 3, fig 4, col 1, lines 9-15, 16-20 col 2, lines 1-4, 42-46, col 3, lines 28-33, col 4, lines 12-14, col 6, lines 8-40, col 11, lines 16-24, 32-34. However, he fails specifically to disclose in a milestone defined for the project; a reporting period; and a percentage completion value of the milestone in the reporting period independent of forecast or actuals. Bates william S

Art Unit: 2162

disclose in a milestone defined for the project; a reporting period; and a percentage completion value of the milestone in the reporting period independent of forecast or actuals. See PP 1-3. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Knudson's system such that it will have milestone in the reporting period. This is because it would improve Knudson's system to have reporting and forecasting ability.

As per claim 25, Knudson et al disclose in storing and accessing data associated with at least one project in a program office database, including informational data, financial data, schedule. See the abstract, fig 1-2, fig 3, fig 4, col 1, lines 9-15, 16-20 col 2, lines 1-4, 42-46, col 3, lines 28-33, col 4, lines 12-14, col 6, lines 8-40, col 11, lines 16-24, 32-34. However, he fails specifically to disclose in a project actual table operable to store actual expenditure amounts spent during a specific reporting period for a project. Bates william S disclose in a project actual table operable to store actual expenditure amounts spent during a specific reporting period for a project. See PP 1-3. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Knudson's

Art Unit: 2162

system such that it will have specific reporting period for a project. This is because it would improve Knudson's system to have reporting and forecasting ability.

As per claim 26, Knudson et al disclose in storing and accessing data associated with at least one project in a program office database, including informational data, financial data, schedule. See the abstract, fig 1-2, fig 3, fig 4, col 1, lines 9-15, 16-20 col 2, lines 1-4, 42-46, col 3, lines 28-33, col 4, lines 12-14, col 6, lines 8-40, col 11, lines 16-24, 32-34. However, he fails specifically to disclose in actual expenditure amounts spent during the specific reporting period for an account. Bates william S disclose in actual expenditure amounts spent during the specific reporting period for an account. See PP 1-3. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Knudson's system such that it will have actual expenditure amounts. This is because it would improve Knudson's system to have accurate reporting period for an account.

As per claim 28, Knudson et al disclose in storing and accessing data associated with at least one project in a program office database, including informational data, financial data, schedule and progress data associated with the at least one project.

Art Unit: 2162

See the abstract, fig 1-2, fig 3, fig 4, col 1, lines 9-15, 16-20 col 2, lines 1-4, 42-46, col 3, lines 28-33, col 4, lines 12-14, col 6, lines 8-40, col 11, lines 16-24, 32-34.

However, he fails specifically to disclose in a project identified by a project identifier and to enable escalated reporting to upper management about unresolved problems. Bates william S disclose in a project identified by a project identifier and to enable escalated reporting to upper management about unresolved problems. See PP 1-3. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Knudson's system such that it will enable escalated reporting to upper management about unresolved problems. This is because it would improve Knudson's system to have accurate reporting period for unresolved problems.

8. Claim 29 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Knudson et al, 5765140 in view of Bates william S as applied to claim 28 above, and further in view of PMBK.

As per claim 29, Knudson et al disclose in storing and accessing data associated with at least one project in a program office database, including informational data, financial data, schedule and progress data associated with the at least one project.

Art Unit: 2162

See the abstract, fig 1-2, fig 3, fig 4, col 1, lines 9-15, 16-20 col 2, lines 1-4, 42-46, col 3, lines 28-33, col 4, lines 12-14, col 6, lines 8-40, col 11, lines 16-24, 32-34.

However, he fails specifically to disclose in roadblock type; date and time the problem was encountered. PMBK disclose in roadblock type; date and time the problem was encountered. See PP 109. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Knudson's system such that it will have project roadblock table. This is because it would improve Knudson's system to have accurate date and time encountership of the problem.

9. Claims 27, 32, 35, 38-40, 42, 44, 45-47, 50, 57, 60-62 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Knudson et al, 5765140 in view of PMBK.

As per claim 27, Knudson et al disclose in storing and accessing data associated with at least one project in a program office database, including informational data, financial data, schedule and progress data associated with the at least one project.

See the abstract, fig 1-2, fig 3, fig 4, col 1, lines 9-15, 16-20 col 2, lines 1-4, 42-46,

Art Unit: 2162

col 3, lines 28-33, col 4, lines 12-14, col 6, lines 8-40, col 11, lines 16-24, 32-34.

However, he fails specifically to disclose in a user table to store a weight value indicative of importance for each system affected by the projects and programs.

PMBK discloses in a user table to store a weight value indicative of importance for each system affected by the projects and programs. See figure 1-1 -- 7-1. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Knudson's system such that it will have a weight value indicative of importance for each system. This is because it would improve Knudson's system to have a user weight table.

As per claim 32, Knudson et al disclose in storing and accessing data associated with at least one project in a program office database, including informational data, financial data, schedule and progress data associated with the at least one project.

See the abstract, fig 1-2, fig 3, fig 4, col 1, lines 9-15, 16-20 col 2, lines 1-4, 42-46, col 3, lines 28-33, col 4, lines 12-14, col 6, lines 8-40, col 11, lines 16-24, 32-34.

He also discloses in storing update data associated with the at least one project; identifying persons associated with the at least one project. See the abstract, fig 1, col 5, lines 1-5. He also discloses in storing and accessing a tactic table having at

Art Unit: 2162

least one predefined tactic supported by the program office database; storing and accessing a tactic type table having at least one valid tactic type; storing and accessing a milestone category table having at least one category of milestones; and storing and accessing a tactic type to milestone category cross-reference table associating the at least one milestone category to the at least one tactic type. See the abstract, col 6, lines 26-29, fig 2, 3, col 5, lines 18-25, col 6, lines 27-30, col 7, lines 40-46, col 10, lines 48-54. However, he fails specifically to disclose in identifying persons associated with at least one project, defining a role hierarchy roles associated with data access, assigning at least one role relevant to the at least one project to each person. PMBK discloses in identifying persons associated with at least one project, defining a role hierarchy roles associated with data access, assigning at least one role relevant to the at least one project to each person. See PP 1, fig 1-1, fig 4-1, fig 5-1, fig 6-1, fig 7-1. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Knudson's system such that it have an hierarchy of roles. This is because it would improve Knudson's system to have hierarchy roles integrity.

Art Unit: 2162

As per claim 35, Knudson et al disclose in the data associated with security access information of personnel. See col 5, lines 18-25, col 6, lines 27-30, col 7, lines 40-46, col 10, lines 48-54. However, he fails specifically to disclose in definitions of an hierarchy of roles. PMBK discloses in definitions of an authorization hierarchy of roles. See fig 1-1, fig 4-1, fig 5-1, fig 6-1, fig 7-1. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Knudson's system such that it have an hierarchy of roles. This is because it would improve Knudson's system to have an authorized data.

As per claim 38, Knudson et al disclose in the associated with security access information of personnel comprise an assignment table associating a person to at least one role defined within a business unit. See the abstract, col 5, lines 18-25, col 6, lines 27-30, col 7, lines 40-46, col 10, lines 48-54. However, he fails specifically to disclose in having manager capable of having authorization to update account data and project data. Bates William discloses in having manager capable of having authorization to update account data and project data. See PP 1-3. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Knudson's system such that it have a manager capable of

Art Unit: 2162

having authorization to update account data and project data. This is because it would improve Knudson's system to have an accurate data.

As per claim 39, Knudson et al disclose in the associated with security access information of personnel comprise an assignment table associating a person to at least one role defined within a business unit. See the abstract, col 5, lines 18-25, col 6, lines 27-30, col 7, lines 40-46, col 10, lines 48-54. However, he fails specifically to disclose in a role definition of a project manager capable of having authorization to update project data. Bates William discloses in a role definition of a project manager capable of having authorization to update project data. See PP 1-3.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Knudson's system such that it have a role definition of a project manager capable of having authorization to update project data. This is because it would improve Knudson's system to have an accurate data.

As per claim 40, Knudson et al disclose in storing and accessing data comprise storing and accessing data stored in at least one relational database. See the abstract, fig 1, fig 2, and fig 4.

Art Unit: 2162

As per claim 42, Knudson et al disclose in the data associated with security access information of personnel. See col 5, lines 18-25, col 6, lines 27-30, col 7, lines 40-46, col 10, lines 48-54. However, he fails specifically to disclose in definitions of an hierarchy of roles. PMBK discloses in definitions of an authorization hierarchy of roles. See fig 1-1, fig 4-1, fig 5-1, fig 6-1, fig 7-1. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Knudson's system such that it have an hierarchy of roles. This is because it would improve Knudson's system to have an authorized data.

As per claim 44, Knudson et al disclose in storing and accessing a data table associating a milestone to the at least one tactic. See the abstract, fig 1-2, fig 3, fig 4, col 1, lines 9-15, 16-20 col 2, lines 1-4, 42-46, col 3, lines 28-33, col 4, lines 12-14, col 6, lines 8-40, col 11, lines 16-24, 32-34.

As per claim 45, Knudson et al disclose in storing and accessing a project forecast table having at least one current budget forecast amount for the project; and storing and accessing a project forecast history table operable to store an initial budget forecast amount if it is different than the at least one current budget forecast amount. See the abstract, fig 1-2, fig 3, fig 4, col 1, lines 9-15, 16-20 col 2, lines 1-

Art Unit: 2162

4, 42-46, col 3, lines 28-33, col 4, lines 12-14, col 6, lines 8-40, col 11, lines 16-24, 32-34.

As per claim 46, Knudson et al disclose in storing and accessing an account forecast table operable to store at least one revenue and expense budget amount associate with an account; and storing and accessing an account actual table operable to store at least one revenue and expense actual amount associated with the account. See the abstract, fig 1-2, fig 3, fig 4, col 1, lines 9-15, 16-20 col 2, lines 1-4, 42-46, col 3, lines 28-33, col 4, lines 12-14, col 6, lines 8-40, col 11, lines 16-24, 32-34.

As per claim 47, Knudson et al disclose in storing and accessing a project table to store informational data associated with at least one project identified by a project identifier; and storing and accessing an account table operable to store informational data associated with at least one account identified by an account identifier. See the abstract, fig 1-2, fig 3, fig 4, col 1, lines 9-15, 16-20 col 2, lines 1-4, 42-46, col 3, lines 28-33, col 4, lines 12-14, col 6, lines 8-40, col 11, lines 16-24, 32-34.

As per claim 50, Knudson et al disclose in storing and accessing the schedule and progress data comprise storing and accessing a milestone actual table having an

Art Unit: 2162

amount of progress into a specific milestone for a given period for a project. See col 1, lines 9-15, 16-20 col 2, lines 1-4, 42-46, col 3, lines 28-33, col 4, lines 12-14, col 6, lines 8-40, col 11, lines 16-24, 32-34.

As per claim 57, it contains the same limitations as claim 30, therefore are rejected by the same rationale.

As per claim 60, Knudson et al disclose in storing data at least one other data source. See col 3, lines 32-34. He also discloses in retrieving the data source. See col 10, lines 4-5, col 12, lines 37-38. However, he fails specifically to disclose in verifying data in the program office database with the data from the at least one other data source. Official notice is taken that verifying data in the program office database with the data from the at least one other data source is old and well known in the art. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to include verifying data in the program office database with the data from the at least one other data source because this would improve Knudson's system to have a verification process.

As per claim 61, Knudson et al disclose in storing data at least one other data source. See col 3, lines 32-34. He also discloses in retrieving the data source. See

Art Unit: 2162

col 10, lines 4-5, col 12, lines 37-38. However, he fails specifically to disclose in using the data from at least one audits. Official notice is taken that using the data from at least one audits is old and well known in the art. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to include using the data from at least one audits because this would improve Knudson's system to have a better auditing method.

As per claim 62, Knudson et al disclose in storing data at least one other data source. See col 3, lines 32-34. He also discloses in retrieving the data source. See col 10, lines 4-5, col 12, lines 37-38.

10. Claim 33, and 59 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Knudson et al, 5765140 in view of PMBK as applied to claim 32 above, and further in view of Bates William.

As per claim 33, Knudson et al disclose in identifying persons further comprises an update authorization level to each person. See the abstract, fig 1, col 5, lines 1-5, col 6, lines, col 6, lines 26-28. However, he fails specifically to disclose in having a senior management role. Bates William discloses in having a senior management role. within the business unit. See PP1-3. Therefore, it would have been obvious to

Art Unit: 2162

one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Knudson's system such that it have a senior management role. This is because it would improve Knudson's system to have an organized business method.

As per claim 59, Knudson et al disclose in storing and accessing update data comprise storing the update data via a self-extracting spread sheet-based user interface implementing a security scheme using the role and update authorization level assignment to the users. See col 6, lines 15-30.

11. Claim 58 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Knudson et al, 5765140 as applied to claim 33 above, and further in view of Gary Hamel et al.

As per claim 58, Knudson et al disclose in storing and accessing the data comprise storing and accessing data via personal computers, servers, server networks. See col 3, lines 1-11. However, he fails specifically to disclose in a web-based user interface. Gary Hamel et al disclose in a web-based user interface. See PP 81-82.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Knudson's system such that it will use web. This is because it would improve Knudson's system to be web integrity.

Art Unit: 2162

12. Claim 63 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being unpatentable over Knudson et al, 5765140.

As per claim 63, Knudson et al disclose in informational data associated with projects, and programs. See the abstract, fig 1-2, fig 4, col 2, lines 1-4, col 3, lines 28-33. He also discloses in financial data associated with the accounts, projects, and programs. See fig 2, fig 4, col 1, lines 16-20, col 2, lines 42-46, col 4, lines 12-14, col 11, lines 16-20. He also discloses in schedule and progress data associated with the accounts, projects, and programs. See the abstract, fig 1-2, fig 4, col 1, lines 9-15, col 2, lines 2-4, 42-45. He also discloses in a personnel data associated with persons having responsibility associated with the projects and programs, the personnel identifier for each person. See col 5, lines 17-28. He also discloses security data having an assignment of at least one role to each person and an assignment of at least one update authorization to certain persons having oversight responsibility; see fig 3, col 6, lines 8-40, col 11, lines 21-24, 32-34. He also discloses in data associated with translating progress milestones. See col 11, lines 38-40, col 12, lines. He also discloses in update data associated with the progress, actual expenditures, and labor resources of the projects and programs. See the

Art Unit: 2162

abstract, col 6, lines 26-29. He also discloses in at least one user interface operable to display data stored in the program office according to a predetermined security scheme based on the person identifier, role and update authorization assignment stored in the at least one program office database, and further operable to receive the update data on a periodic basis. See fig 2, 3, col 5, lines 18-25, col 6, lines 27-30, col 7, lines 40-46, col 10, lines 48-54.

Allowable Subject Matter

13. Claims 34, 36-37, 41, 48-49, 51-56 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Art Unit: 2162

Response to Arguments

14. Applicant's arguments filed on 08/23/01 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive with respect to claims 1-33, 35, 38-40, 42-47, 50-63.

15. The Applicant argues that Claim 1 recites, in part, "a tactic table operable to store at least one predefined tactic supported by the program office database and a tactic type for each tactic", and "a tactic type to progress milestone category cross-reference table operable to map at least one progress milestone category to the at least one tactic type". The cited portion of Knudson generally involves a master database, project tasks, a project plan and users. The cited portion of Knudson does not involve a "tactic" or a "tactic type" of any kind, nor has the Examiner provided any explanation of how Knudson teaches or suggests these elements of Claim 1.

The Examiner disagrees. Because Knudson does not only involve in a master database, project tasks, a project plan and users but also discloses in a "tactic type" table. For more reference, fig 2, col 2, lines 29-31, 56- 63, fig 4, col 2, lines 36-38, col 7, lines 26-46. In figure 4, the revise project plan is the same as a tactic table because it stores a predefined supported by the program office database. Also figure 1, (project 1 and project 2) is a tactic table that store at least one predefined tactic.

Art Unit: 2162

Therefore, Knudson does teach or suggest every limitation of Claim 1.

Also dependent Claims 2, 4-8, 11-12, 16, 18-20, 23, 30-31, which depend from independent Claim 1, are rejected due to their dependency on the rejected base claims.

The Applicant also argues that Claim 32 recites, in part, "storing and accessing a tactic table having at least one predefined tactic supported by the program office database" and "storing and accessing a tactic type table having at least one valid tactic type". As shown above, Knudson does not teach or suggest these elements and PMBK is not relied upon by the Examiner to teach these elements, nor does PMBK teach or suggest these elements.

The Examiner disagrees. Because Knudson discloses in storing and accessing a tactic table having at least one predefined tactic supported by the program office database" and "storing and accessing a tactic type table having at least one valid tactic type. See col 1, lines 49-52. It describes how Microsoft project is planning, managing, storing and accessing a tactic table. Also see figure 1, (project 1 and project 2) is a tactic table that store at least one predefined tactic. Therefore, Knudson does teach or suggest every limitation of Claim 32. Applicant also argues

Art Unit: 2162

that PMBK does not suggest these elements. The examiner disagrees. Because PMBK suggests those elements mentioned in the above. See fig 1-1, 4-1-9.1, 12-1. It describes about project management that includes activity definition, project plan which implies storing update data, defining a role of data access and assign project to an individual. It also implies storing and accessing category table associating with at least one tactic type.

Therefore, for the above reasons, Claim 32 is rejected over Knudson and PMBK.

The applicant also argues that claim 63 recites, in part, "a tactic table operable to store at least one predefined tactic supported by the program office database and a tactic type for each tactic" and "a tactic type to progress milestone category cross-reference table operable to map at least one progress milestone category to the at least one tactic type". As shown above, Knudson does not teach or suggest these elements of Claim 63.

The examiner disagrees. Because Knudson discloses in a tactic table operable to store at least one predefined tactic supported by the program office database and a tactic type for each tactic" and "a tactic type to progress milestone category cross-reference table operable to map at least one progress milestone category to the

Art Unit: 2162

at least one tactic type" see the abstract, fig 2, col 2, lines 29-31, 56- 63, fig 4, col 2, lines 36-38, col 7, lines 26-46. Particularly, figure 4, the describes revise, assign and create project plan(s) which implies a tactic type to progress the desired plan; and is similar to what the applicant has described in the above. Therefore, because of the above reasons, claim 63 is rejected.

The applicant also argues that for dependent claim 3, the prior art, Gary Hamel does not teach "data associated with translating progress milestones defined in the projects to tactics defined in the system", "a tactic table operable to store at least one predefined tactic supported by the program office database and a tactic type for each tactic", and "a tactic type to progress milestone category cross-reference table operable to map at least one progress milestone category to the at least one tactic type" as recited by Claim 1, nor is Gary Hamel relied on to teach this limitation.

The examiner disagrees. Because the examiner never mentioned that Gary suggests the elements in the above; however Knudson suggests the elements mentioned in the above. See the explanation given in the above for claim 1. However, Gary suggests the missing element in Knudson which is web-based user interface. See Page 82.

Second column, lines 43-46 which implies a user interface in a web environment.

Art Unit: 2162

Therefore, Claim 3 is rejected. For the above reasons.

The applicant also argues that for dependent Claims 9, 13 and 14, Bates William does not teach "data associated with translating progress milestones defined in the projects to tactics defined in the system", "a tactic table operable to store at least one predefined tactic supported by the program office database and a tactic type for each tactic", and "a tactic type to progress milestone category cross-reference table operable to map at least one progress milestone category to the at least one tactic type" as recited by Claim 1, nor is Bates William relied on to teach this limitation.

The Examiner disagrees. Because knudson suggests in "data associated with translating progress milestones defined in the projects to tactics defined in the system", "a tactic table operable to store at least one predefined tactic supported by the program office database and a tactic type for each tactic", and "a tactic type to progress milestone category cross-reference table operable to map at least one progress milestone category to the at least one tactic type. See the reason given in the above for claim 1. Bates william discloses in senior management role in a business unit. See page 2. Therefore, claims 9, 13 and 14 are rejected for the above reasons.

Art Unit: 2162

The applicant also argues that for dependent Claims dependent Claims 10 and 15 PMBK does not teach "data associated with translating progress milestones defined in the projects to tactics defined in the system", "a tactic table operable to store at least one predefined tactic supported by the program office database and a tactic type for each tactic", and "a tactic type to progress milestone category cross-reference table operable to map at least one progress milestone category to the at least one tactic type" as recited by Claim 1, nor is PMBK relied on to teach this limitation.

The examiner disagrees. Because knudson suggests in "data associated with translating progress milestones defined in the projects to tactics defined in the system", "a tactic table operable to store at least one predefined tactic supported by the program office database and a tactic type for each tactic", and "a tactic type to progress milestone category cross-reference table operable to map at least one progress milestone category to the at least one tactic type" see reasons given for claims 1 and 63 in the above. Also PMBK discloses in an hierarchy of roles having access to the data. See fig 1-1, 4-1-9-1, 12-1. These figures imply the role of security access information.

Art Unit: 2162

Therefore, Claims 10 and 15 are rejected for the above reasons.

Concerning dependent claims 24-26, 28 and 29, see the reason given in the above for claims 1 and 63.

Concerning dependent claims 33 and 59, see the reason given in the above for claims 1 and 63.

Conclusion

16. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

A. Wolters, Jr. et al, 5826252 October 20, 1998. A system for managing multiple projects of a similar type has a global project management database for storing data for all participating projects which is dynamically updated with best current data representing best current practices across all participating projects in the system.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to **Mussie Tesfamariam** whose telephone number is **(703)305-1393**. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday from 9:30 a.m. to 6:30 p.m. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are

Art Unit: 2162

unsuccessful, the **examiner's supervisor, Eric stamber** can be reached at **(703) 305-8469**.

Any response to this office action should be mailed to:

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Washington, D.C. 20231

or **faxed to:**

(703)746-7239, (for formal communications intended for entry)

Or:

(703)746-7240, (for informal or draft communications, please label

"PROPOSED" or "DRAFT")

or


(703)746-7238, (for After-final)

Hand-delivered responses should be brought to **Crystal park II, 2121 Crystal Drive**

Arlington, Virginia, (Receptionist).

Mussie Tesfamariam

November 14, 2001


ERIC W. STAMBER
PRIMARY EXAMINER